

## REMARKS

Applicants elect with traverse to continue prosecution of claims 1-6 and 11-19 (Group I). Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.143, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement with respect to Claims 7-10 and 20-25 (Group II), for reasons set forth below.

Section 803 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.) sets out two criteria for proper requirement of restriction: (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; *and* (2) there must be a *serious burden* on the Examiner if restriction is required. Applicants do not contest that the first criteria, namely that the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed, is met.

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the second criteria specified by M.P.E.P. §803 is not met with regard to Group II. Because the inventions defined by various claims within Groups I and II include a number of common or substantially related elements, in order to properly examine the inventions defined by claims in Group I, it will likely be necessary for the Examiner to also search art relevant to claims in Group II as well. As such, there will be no significant additional burden imposed by examination of the claims of Groups I and II together, and the Examiner would not be seriously burdened by examination of the claims of Groups I and II together.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel J. Santos/  
Daniel J. Santos, Reg. No. 40,158

**GARDNER GROFF SANTOS & GREENWALD, P.C.**  
Tel: 770.984.2300  
Fax: 770.984.0098